

CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

ONE DOLLAR PER ANNUM.]

"I AM SET FOR THE DEFENCE OF THE GOSPEL."—Paul.

PAYABLE AT THE END OF SIX MONTHS

VOL. IV.

PORTLAND, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1825.

No. 20.

Doctrinal.

LETTER

Addressed to the people of England by Right Honorable William Pitt, Earl of Chatham.

"Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their afflictions, and to keep one's self unspotted from the world."

Gentlemen—Whoever takes a view of the world, will find, that what the greatest part of mankind have agreed to call religion, has been only some outward exercise, esteemed sufficient to work a reconciliation with God. It has moved them to build temples, slay victims, offer up sacrifices, to fast and feast, to petition and thank, to laugh and cry, to sing and sigh, by turns; but it has not yet been found sufficient to induce them to break off an amour, to make restitution of ill-gotten wealth, or to bring the passions and appetites to a reasonable subjection. Differ as much as they may in opinion, concerning what they ought to believe, or in what manner they ought to serve God, as they call it; yet they all agree in gratifying their appetites. The same passion reigns eternally in all countries and in all ages; Jew and Mahometan, the Christian and the Pagan, the Tartar and the Indian, all kinds of men, who differ in almost every thing else, universally agree with regard to their passions. If there be any difference among them, it is this, that the more superstitious, they are always the more vicious; and the more they believe, the less they practise. This is a melancholy consideration to a good mind. It is a truth, and certainly, above all things, worth our while to inquire into. We will therefore probe the wound, and search to the bottom; we will lay the axe to the root of the tree, and show you the true reason why men go on sinning and repenting, and sinning again, through the whole course of their lives: and the reason is, because they have been taught, most wickedly taught, that religion and virtue are two things absolutely distinct; that the deficiency of the one might be supplied by the sufficiency of the other; and that what you want in virtue, you must make up in religion. But this religion, so dishonorable to God, and so pernicious to men, is worse than atheism; for atheism, though it takes away one great motive to support virtue in distress, yet it furnishes no man with arguments to be vicious: but superstition, or what the world means by religion, is the greatest possible encouragement to vice, by setting up something as religion, which shall atone and commute for the want of virtue. This is establishing iniquity by a law, the highest law; by authority, the highest authority; that of God himself. We complain of the vices of the world, and of the wickedness of men, without searching into the true cause. It is not because they are wicked by nature, for that is both false and impious; but because, to serve the purposes of their pretended soul-savers, they have been carefully taught that they are wicked by nature, and cannot help continuing so. It would have been impossible for men to have been both religious and vicious, had religion been made to consist wherein alone it does consist; and had they been always taught, that true religion is the practice of virtue in obedience to the will of God, who presides over all things, and will finally make every man happy who does his duty.

The single opinion in religion, that all things are so well made by the Deity, that virtue is its own reward, and that happiness will ever arise from acting according to the reason of things; or that God, ever wise and good, will provide some extraordinary happiness for those who suffer for virtue's sake; is enough to support a man under all difficulties, to keep him steady to his duty, and to enable him to stand as firm as a rock, amidst all the charms of applause, profit and honor. But this religion of reason, which all men are capable of, has been neglected and condemned, and another set up, the natural consequences of which have puzzled men's understandings, and debauched their morals, more than all the lewd poets and atheistical philosophers that ever infested the world: for instead of being taught, that religion consists in action, or obedience to the eternal moral law of God, we have been most gravely and venerably told, that it consists in the belief of certain opinions, which we could form no idea of, or which were contrary to the clear perceptions of our minds, or which had no tendency to make us either wiser or bet-

ter, or, which is much worse, had a manifest tendency to make us immoral. And this belief, this impious belief arising from imposition on one side, and from want of examination on the other, has been called by the sacred name of religion; whereas real and genuine religion consists in knowledge and obedience. We know there is a God; and we know his will; which is, that we should do all the good we can; and we are assured, from his perfections, that we shall find our own good in so doing. And what would we have more? Are we, after such inquiry, and in an age full of liberty, children still? And cannot we be quiet, unless we have holy romances, sacred fables and traditionary tales to amuse us in an idle hour, and to give rest to our souls, when our follies and vices will not suffer us to rest?

You have been taught, indeed, that right belief, or orthodoxy, will, like charity, cover a multitude of sins; but be not deceived; belief of, or mere assent to the truth of propositions upon evidence, is not a virtue, nor unbelief a vice; faith is not a voluntary act, it does not depend upon the will; every man must believe or disbelieve, whether he will or not, according as evidence appears to him. If, therefore, men, however dignified or distinguished, command us to believe, they are guilty of the highest folly and absurdity, because it is out of our power; but if they command us to believe, and annex rewards to belief, and severe penalties to unbelief, then they are most wicked and immoral, because they annex rewards and punishments to what is involuntary, and therefore neither rewardable or punishable. It appears, then, very plainly unreasonable and unjust to command us to believe any doctrine, good or bad, wise or unwise; but when men command us to believe opinions, which not only have no tendency to promote virtue, but which are allowed to commute or atone for the want of it, then are they arrived at the utmost pitch of impiety; then is their iniquity full; then have they finished the misery, and completed the destruction of poor mortal man: by betraying the interests of virtue, they have undermined and sapped the foundation of all human happiness; and how treacherously and dreadfully have they betrayed it! A gift, well applied; the chattering of some unintelligible sounds called creeds; an unfeigned assent and consent to whatever the church enjoins, religious worship and consecrated feasts; repenting on a death bed; pardons rightly sued out; and absolution authoritatively given, have done more towards making and continuing men vicious, than all the natural passions and infidelity put together; for infidelity can only take away the supernatural rewards of virtue; but these superstitious opinions and practices, have not only turned the scene, and made men lose sight of the natural rewards of it, but have induced them to think, that were there no hereafter, vice would be preferable to virtue, and that they increase in happiness as they increase in wickedness; and this they have been taught in several religious discourses and sermons, delivered by men whose authority was never doubted, particularly by a late reverend prelate, I mean Bishop Atterbury, in his sermon on these words: "If in this life only be hope, then we are of all men most miserable"; where vice and faith ride most lovingly and triumphantly together. But these doctrines of the natural excellency of vice, the efficacy of a right belief, the dignity of atonements and propitiations, have, beside depriving us of the native beauty and charms of honesty, and thus cruelly stabbing virtue to the heart, raised and diffused among men a certain unnatural passion, which we shall call religious hatred; a hatred constant, deep-rooted, and immortal. All other passions rise and fall, die and revive again; but this of religious and pious hatred rises and grows every day stronger upon the mind as we grow more religious, because we hate for God's sake, and for the sake of those poor souls too, who have the misfortune not to believe as we do, and can we in so good a cause hate too much? The more thoroughly we hate, the better we are; and the more mischief we do to the bodies and estates of those infidels and heretics, the more do we show our love to God. This is religious zeal, and this has been called divinity; but remember the only true divinity is humanity.

W. PITT.

The charms and comforts of virtue are inexpressible; and can only be justly conceived by those who possess her. The consciousness of Divine approbation and support, and the steady hope of future happiness, communicate a peace and joy, to which all the delights of this world bear no resemblance.

Polemical.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

TO ARMINIUS.

SIR—The apology which I have to offer, why you have not before this received an answer to your last letter to me, is this; in consequence of the late irregular publication of the *Intelligencer*; together with some private engagements of my own; it has not been possible for me to get a communication into the paper, before the present number. You will therefore please not to impute the late appearance of this, to an indisposition to notice your letter; or to a conviction, that it could not be readily answered.

Since you profess to have replied to my last, in a "methodical" manner, dividing your communication into four parts; I shall proceed to notice briefly, those divisions accordingly as you have arranged them. But in the onset, I must observe, in order to confirm a note made by the editor, repelling a charge which some of his enemies have made, relative to his being the author of the letters, signed "A UNIVERSALIST," that he is no more the writer of them, than I am of your communications, or indeed of any other writings which I never saw till they appeared in print. In short, the writer of these articles has not the honor of being the editor of the *Intelligencer*.

First. "You blow up quite a cloud of dust," to shelter yourself from the charge, justly made against you, of having arrogated to yourself the sacred honors of divine inspiration. You endeavor to excuse yourself, by singing to me the Syren song of invitation; endeavoring to persuade me to acknowledge the same of myself, which you have asserted to be true of yourself; and thereby to get me into the same dilemma. You ask me, if I am not also willing to acknowledge, that I am dictated, in what I write by the Spirit of God? Should I give you, as you desire, an affirmative answer; I am aware that the next I might hear from you, would be the song of rejoicing—"How we apples swim!" If you have got into a difficulty, I am certainly willing to help you out; but I cannot consent to do it by gratifying you so much, as to involve myself in the same. The best way for you to relieve yourself, I believe, will be to acknowledge that you have done wrong in charging the Holy Spirit, with your inconsistencies. When you involve yourself in difficulty again, do not say you were "led" into it "by the Spirit of God," and you will be less exposed to unpleasant consequences.

Secondly. You charge me with neglect to notice, what you call, "the main subject of dispute between us." It is new to me, to learn that there is a main subject of dispute; and I am happy to ascertain from you, what it is. As near as I can learn, you want me to "dispute" "What we understand by salvation as the gift of God; and also what we understand by the reward of works." You made, it is true, some assertions concerning this, in a former letter, which I did not particularly notice; because, it is the proof and not the ipse dixit, with which I concern myself. The proofs which you suggested, I did not pass by; but stated that you had mistaken, in calling them scripture. I told you that, those passages were not in the Bible; and called on you to produce them, if I was incorrect. This you have not done. They are as follows: "As death leaves them, so judgment will find them," and "there is no repentance after death;" and again, "If ye die in your sins, whither I am going ye never shall come." When you will give to the ideas, which you advanced at that time, a sufficient importance, by proving that those texts which you quoted as the foundation of your faith, are in the bible; (and you say, you have read them, and heard them quoted more times than I am years old) I promise you, that you shall not again have occasion to say, that I have said "just nothing" upon "the main subject in dispute."

Your third particular contains an acknowledgement of your own inconsistency in giving your preference to those Calvinistic ministers, who "preach one doctrine and believe another," "Still we must remember," continue you, "that on account of the REVIVALS, &c. which take place under their labours and preaching, we must acknowledge they are owned and blessed of God." Here, it is probable that you and I, my friend, may differ. I have not so much confidence in their revivals, as you call them, as you seem to have. I fear that they are generally produced by mere human artifice and violent exertions, which produce the so much boasted results, by feeding the passions and

starving the understanding. I cannot receive these revivals, as the evidence that "they are owned and blessed of God;" until I can also believe, that "God owns and blesses them," for "preaching one doctrine and believing another;" for this is the very way that they are known to succeed most, in producing them!

Fourthly. You enjoin it upon me, to "do away if you can the force of John viii. 24. 'If ye die in your sins, &c. and you greatly weaken the evidence for endless misery.'" In this text you say, "we are expressly told, that the finally impenitent shall never enter heaven. They shall never go to that blessed Lord, who is seated at the right hand of God in glory." This phrase, which you have so often triumphantly produced, though it is not in the Bible, you seem to rely upon as the greatest evidence in favor of the unmerciful doctrine of endless torture. I might with the greatest propriety, forbear any remarks upon what you have said above; but as you may probably continue to challenge me with that unscriptural text; and as you and your denomination generally seem to misconstrue the scriptures, from which I suppose you have gathered that famous text; I shall proceed here, to state what the scriptures do say, and to show you briefly where your error lies. See John viii. 21. "I go my way and ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins: Whither I go, ye cannot come. Then said the Jews, will he kill himself, because he saith—Whither I go ye cannot come? And he said unto them, ye are from beneath, I am from above, &c. I said therefore unto you, That ye shall die in your sins; for if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins." All this, you will perceive, is very different from saying "If ye die in your sins, whether I am going ye cannot come." The conjunction *if* is not affixed to "die," but to "believe." It is not *if you die in your sins*, whether I go ye cannot come; but *if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins*." "Whither I go ye cannot come" is another and a separate declaration, which is subject to no conditions. There is no "if" about it; neither is it a condition of dying in sin, as your imaginary self-created text makes it. But you will tell me—All who do not believe will die in their sins; and all who do not believe are assured, that "whether I go ye cannot come;" how then will you have them, in heaven? Here let me inquire. To whom did Christ address himself. Answer. To the Jews. Are they not assured that, where Christ has gone they never can come? Yes, say you, and that is proof positive that they never will be saved. But you believe that the apostles and all christians will be saved? Surely you do. Then I will call your attention to John xiii. 33, where Christ tells his disciples—"Ye shall seek me; and as I said unto the Jews; Whither I go ye cannot come, so now I say unto you." Now dear sir, when you will tell me how you get Christ's disciples into heaven, then I will tell you how I believe the Jews also will be saved. In the mean time, remember the words of Paul: "All Israel (Jews) shall be saved."

By this time you will begin to conclude, that your favorite text does not answer your purpose; and perhaps you are disposed to inquire, how these difficulties can be explained? That I might leave for you to do; and shall so leave it for the present, after having given you a few hints to improve upon. And first, remember forever hereafter; that "Whither I go ye cannot come" is not stated as a consequence of dying in sin. It is a positive declaration, made both to the unbelieving Jews and to the Christian disciples. Again, you suppose that "to die in sin" means a literal death of the body. But surely you ought to stop and inquire: "Who then can be saved?" for no sinner (and "all have sinned") ever died a natural death, destitute of sin. According to the scriptures, those who die in their sins are those who believe not. "If ye believe not (i. e. in the present tense) ye shall die," &c. Of course such as do believe will not die this death. Now look at the 51 verse of this same 8th chap. "If a man keep my sayings, he shall never see death." Here the believer is to avoid the same death, which the unbeliever experiences. But will you now say, it is the death of the body? Will not the believer die naturally? Yes. Then it is evident, that the death to be avoided or to be experienced, is not a natural one, as you and thousands of others have erroneously supposed.

By this time, I think you will agree with me, that "to die in sins" is the same as the apostle speaks of, when he says, "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and in sins." "When sin revived, I died." "To be carnally minded is death." From this death, it is possible for God to raise even the unbelieving Jews. Eph. ii. 4, 5, 6. "But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace are ye saved,) and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus." And when these Jews, whom he addressed, come to know Christ, or to believe in him, they will be "delivered from this body of sin and death." That even they will thus know him, we are informed by Christ himself, in the same chapter, and in four verses following the text upon which I have been commenting. "Then said Jesus unto them

(the Jews) When ye have lifted up the Son of Man, then shall ye know, that I am he." Again, John xii. 32. "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." John vi. 44, 45. "No man can come to me except the Father which hath sent me draw him; and I will raise him up at the last day. It is written in the prophets, And they all shall be taught of God. Every man therefore, that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me."

I could pursue this pleasing subject longer, but my time and limits at present, forbid. I shall conclude, by inquiring whether you are willing now to acknowledge, that this explanation has "greatly weakened the evidence for endless misery?" I shall also expect you to refer me, in your next, to the places where I may find those texts (upon which you ground your faith) which you asserted and I denied were in the bible; and lastly, I insist upon an answer to the former unanswered question. "Did Adam and Eve surely die upon the day of transgression, as God declared they should; or did they not as the devil promised them, and limitations now maintain?"

A UNIVERSALIST.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

REMARKS

On the Communication of "CYPRIAN," relative to ORIGEN.

"CYPRIAN" professes to demonstrate by the case of Origen, that Universalism cannot have been revealed to mankind by the Son of God, or promulgated by the apostles, or by the primitive preachers of christianity. To do this, he relies on the fact that about A. D. 228, Origen directed that Universalism should be kept as a secret from all who had not made high attainments in divine knowledge. From this fact he draws the following conclusions, viz. Origen's advice to keep this doctrine as a secret from the generality of christians, proves that it was not generally known among them in his day; and this proves that it was not preached by the apostles, as it would have been impossible, in the course of one hundred or one hundred and fifty years, to have exterminated a doctrine preached by them, without producing a great contention in the church, some accounts of which must have come down to us. Such is "Cyprian's" argument.

Now this argument, however plausible it seems, is opposed to facts, and to the opinion of the most judicious historians. There were sentiments broached and received in the church, contrary to the apostolic doctrine even within a hundred years after the death of St. John; and no accounts have reached us of any contentions which their establishment excited. Not more than ten or fifteen years after the death of St. John, or between A. D. 106 and 116, one of the most eminent of the Apostolic Fathers, taught as implicit obedience to ministers as the Church of Rome demands for her clergy. The doctrine of the Chiliasts appears to have been universally received in the church from about A. D. 140, till Origen's time. The doctrine of the annihilation of the wicked was avowed by the distinguished christian father, Justin, about A. D. 160, and by the no less distinguished Irenæus, in 177. Not to proceed with a catalogue, of which it would be difficult to find the end, it is notorious that the style of writing, the manner of treating subjects, and the train of thinking, among christians, underwent an astonishing change between the days of the apostles, and the end of the second century. I do not think that one who reads the writings of those times without an improper veneration for antiquity, will lay it down as an axiom that the prevalence of a doctrine, say at the year 200, proves that it was taught by the apostles; or that the general ignorance of a doctrine at that time, proves that it was not taught by them. Nor is this opinion singular: Mosheim strongly censures the Christian fathers of the second century for adducing as proofs the decisions of those bishops who ruled the apostolic churches; and his learned translator, Dr. MacLaine says, in reference to writers in the beginning of the third century, "we scarcely know any case in which the plea of prescription can be admitted as a satisfactory argument, in favor of religious tenets or articles of faith, unless by prescription be meant, a doctrine's being established in the time, and by the authority of the apostles." In all other cases, prescription is no argument at all." People are not apt to contend very strenuously for the establishment of a rule which will overthrow their own favorite tenets: Now, if "Cyprian" is a Calvinist or Hopkinsian, as is suspected, he ought to remember that his doctrine of election and reprobation was unknown in the Christian Church till after the year 400; and that his manner of distinguishing between the natural and the regenerated man, together with his view of the nature of conversion, was unthought of, till long afterwards, I know not when.

Let us now attend to the matter of fact on which "Cyprian" founded what he thinks a demonstration, &c. I must here say a word or two concerning that paragraph in "The Life of Origen," in which the fact alluded

to, is stated. I there observed, "it is stated, however, that Origen directed that the doctrine of Universal Restoration should be kept as a secret," &c. I did not then know what Origen meant by this advice; nor do I now know. Indeed, I do not know that this was the advice which he gave; for I have never read this in Origen's own writings. Nor did I state it as a matter of positive fact; I stated, "it is said, that" &c. My authority was, I think, Dr. Chauncey, Dr. Burnet, and the author of a Preface to a Treatise of Jeremiah White. Now the real fact is, that whatever advice Origen gave on this point, he himself did not hesitate repeatedly to make this doctrine as public as his writings could make it; and this too, when he knew that his instructions were eagerly sought by all classes from the Prince to the slave, from bishops to private christians, and from the philosophers to the barbarians. He knew that his theological fame had awakened the utmost interest from Africa and Italy to the regions bordering on the Euxine and the Euphrates; and yet he did not hesitate to suffer the doctrine in question to go forth under the powerful sanction of his name. But here "Cyprian" says that "the work in which Universalism is advanced," (by which I suppose that he means Origen's Book of Principles) "does not appear to have been circulated till after his death." What authority has "Cyprian" for this novel assertion? Will he come forward, and inform us where, and by what, this appears? No, Mr. Editor, I venture to predict that he will not. If he can do it, he may certainly add one fact to those that are generally known concerning Origen's Life. Could he, however, adduce any authority for his assertion, it would not alter the general fact under consideration; for Origen published the doctrine of Universalism in other works, besides his Book of Principles. He published it in his Homilies on Leviticus; in his Homilies on Numbers; in his Homilies on Ezekiel; in his Tracts on Matthew; in his Tracts on John; in his Book against Celsus; and in how many other works, I know not.

Some notice ought to be taken of the following passage in "Cyprian's" communication: "The work in which Universalism is advanced, does not appear to have been circulated till after his death, when his real or supposed errors were condemned." I do not know what "Cyprian" meant by this, but he would be generally understood to mean, that as soon as Origen's works which contain the doctrine of Universalism were circulated, that doctrine was condemned. Now the fact is, we have no account of any sentence of condemnation passed on Origen's doctrine, till about 150 years after his death. Even then, it was chiefly his notion concerning the Trinity, that drew upon him the censure of the church; if we ought not rather to impute it all to the quarrel of Jerome with his rival, who happened to be a professed admirer of Origen. It is true, that historians generally believe that in the year 353, which was 201 years after Origen's death, his doctrine of the Universal Restoration was condemned by the Fifth General Council held at Constantinople.

To conclude: "Cyprian" does not seem to be aware that Universalism was taught in the Church before Origen's time. Clemens Alexandrinus, the most learned of the christian fathers before Origen, taught it in 194; and there is a book extant, allowed to have been written by a christian, about A. D. 130, or at the latest, between that time and A. D. 180, in which this doctrine is asserted.

MARCUS.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

EXAMINATION, &c.

CONTINUED.

That the objections to Mr. Tripp's exposition of those passages which designate the number of "the witnesses," to which we referred in the concluding paragraph of our last communication, are well founded, we shall attempt to prove, by the following arguments.

1. The number of those witnesses, according to the declaration of St. John, is but two; whereas that of the Albigenes, &c. upon the most moderate calculation, exceeded a million. Now by what mode of computation a million witnesses can form "two witnesses," we confess that we are unable to discover. Such computations, to say the least, have rather a paradoxical appearance. For what is a witness? Is not a witness a person or thing bearing testimony to some truth, or to the occurrence of some event? And does not every person or thing thus employed form a separate witness? Does it not hence follow that the number of witnesses must be always computed by the number of persons or things uniting in their testimony for the purposes just mentioned? Would any reasonable man adopt any other method of computation? Yet from a rule prescribed by common sense, the system to which we object, supposes an inspired apostle to have departed. We are aware, however, that it may be replied that the sects above mentioned, may be styled two, because they derive their knowledge of the truths to which they bear testimony from two sources, viz. the old and new testaments. What is this

but to confound together two subjects entirely distinct from each other—the channels through which a knowledge of truth may be derived, and the persons who may have derived such knowledge through the instrumentality of those channels? If, through the medium of a telescope, for example, a knowledge of some occurrence which took place at a distance, and which could not be perceived by the naked eye, could be obtained, would any man think of identifying the person making use of such an instrument and who by means of it derived whatever knowledge he may possess relative to the supposed fact, with the instrument itself?

2. If the sects in question can, in connection with the scriptures, be styled "witnesses for Christ," it may be supposed that a perfect harmony exists between the doctrines contained in the bible, and the tenets maintained by Wickliff and Huss, the Albigenses, &c. Such a supposition is natural. For "witnesses for Christ," and consequently for the truth, cannot contradict each other, in the testimony they bear to doctrines forming either the whole, or parts of the sacred code of divine revelation. The correctness of the foregoing principles appears to us so self-evident, that we should consider an attempt to prove the truth of them an insult offered to the understanding of the reader.

3. The least that can be expected from the histories of persons upon whom such encomiums have been bestowed, is that they would have been good members of society, loyal and obedient subjects to the governments under which they respectively lived, and that the propagation of the doctrines maintained by them, so far from having a tendency to disturb the tranquility, and destroy the happiness of society, would have been attended by the most salutary effects: in a word, that their general conduct would have formed a model worthy of the imitation of succeeding ages. Whether such ideas as we are naturally led to form from the representations given by Mr. Tripp and others of the characters of the principal subjects of this examination, are confirmed by an appeal to historical facts, the reader will be shortly able to determine. For the view with which we shall now present our readers, we are chiefly indebted to a work entitled "Letters to a Prebendary," by Dr. John Milner, an eminent Catholic Prelate, now residing in England, which was intended as a reply to a publication entitled "Reflections on Popery," by the late Dr. Sturges, Prebendary and Chancellor of Winchester. The work of Dr. Milner to which we now allude, it cannot be denied, settled the controversy which had been pending between two of the most eminent scholars and theologians of the age. It has been spoken of in terms of the highest commendation by many learned and intelligent protestants. It was, in a particular manner, complimented in a speech delivered in the British House of Lords, by the late Dr. Samuel Horsley, then bishop of St. Asaph, a man, who, while living, was justly styled "the light and glory" of the Anglican church.

Dr. Milner introduces his account of the Albigenses, Turlupins, Beghardi, &c. by observing, p. 76, that "in the catalogue of errors which have prevailed in different ages, there was one of a most impious, perfidious, and infamous nature." He then furnishes a concise view of the origin, history, and doctrines of the ancient Manichæans, to whose errors he proves the above mentioned sects to have adhered. He further observes, "The leading tenet of this system was, the doctrine of two principles or deities, one the author of good spirits, the New Testament, &c.; the other, of the flesh, of the old law, and of the Old Testament. Hence, by a necessary consequence, flowed the impieties and abominations already alluded to, which all cotemporary writers, and the judicial acts still extant, prove to have been held by the Manichæans, their denial of Christ's incarnation, their defiling the volumes of the bible, and the plate of the altar, their avowed system of perjury, their condemning the use of all animal food as impure, and still more the propagation of mankind, as concurring to the work of the evil deity, whilst they let loose the reins to every sensuality which was not productive of that important end." [They also prohibited marriage, by denying that salvation could be obtained in a state of wedlock.] "This error, like most others, branched out into a variety of sects, and assumed different names. It was translated into France, Italy, and Spain, from Bulgaria, in the tenth and eleventh centuries, from which circumstance its adherents obtained the general name of *Bulgari*, a name which has ever since continued to denote persons addicted to the infamous practices with which they were infected. They were also called in different times and places, Albigenses, Poplicoli, Paterini, Cathari, Bogomili, Turlupins, Beghardi, Brethren of the Free Spirit, &c. [In the twelfth century, this destructive sect made its appearance in England, but did not succeed there, the apostles of it being abandoned with abhorrence by all mankind.] Confiding in their numbers, and in the power of their protectors, the Counts of Thoulouse, Foix, &c. they proceeded to propagate their opinions by the sword, burning down churches and monasteries, and perpetrating indiscriminate slaughter on all ages, degrees, and sexes."

Such is the representation which this learned and able writer has given of the above sects, the defence of which, after a faint effort to save their credit, his no less learned and able opponent was compelled to relinquish. At the request of several distinguished members of the established church, and particularly at the solicitation of Bishop Horsley, who made a personal application to him for that purpose, Dr. Milner was dissuaded from pursuing the advantages he had undeniably gained over his rival, by a continuation of the controversy.

The authorities upon which the foregoing charges are grounded, are Rainerus, Hovoden, Matthew Paris, the Acts of the Council of Albi and Lateran, William of Brittany, the Protestant Centuriators of Magdeburg, Limborch, the Dictionary of Dr. Cooper, bishop of Winchester, a divine of the church of England. To these may be added Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. vol. iii. p. 284, MacLaine's translation. [N. B. It is the English edition of the work last noticed to which Dr. M. refers his readers.]

EXAMINER.

Christian Intelligencer.

PORTLAND. SATURDAY, FEB. 12, 1825.

"I AM SET FOR THE DEFENCE OF THE GOSPEL."

LAW RELIGION—AGAIN.

We offered some brief remarks, not long since, on the manœuvres in the State of New-York, preparatory to the establishment of a religion by law. Allusion was had to the very modest and pious acts of Secretary Yates, Superintendent of their common schools. Though we make no pretensions to the gift of prophecy or divination, we expressed an opinion that his recommendation was designed to prepare the way for something more authoritative, but directed to the same point; and we were not mistaken. For the same superintendent has since commanded the officers of common schools, throughout the State, to assemble the children of each town, for celebrations, and that religious exercises be established among them. He extols Dr. Proudfit, of Salem, N. Y. as the superlatively praiseworthy author of the benevolent plan, for establishing that kind of religion by law; and renews his official recommendation that schools be supplied with Tracts, either from the public funds, by private donation, or by selling tickets to the spectators at the proposed celebrations.—Elated with their success in thus far imposing on the credulity and good nature of the people of that flourishing commonwealth, the New-York "Tract Society" have made proposals to the American Tract Society at Andover, to unite in one grand scheme, and take the name of the NATIONAL TRACT SOCIETY, intending, no doubt, to get their Tracts into every school in the United States. "The proposals were cordially received," and are "under consideration." An appropriation of fifty thousand dollars is spoken of by the New York Tract Society, for erecting a building for this *National Tract Society*, "corresponding," say they, "with the other public edifices of New-York."

Such is the deep-laid plan of the ambitious, orthodox clergy, for the establishment of a law-religion, in this country; and unless they are checked and restrained by the interposition of legislatures, and the firm resistance of an enlightened public, they will succeed, in defiance of the express provisions of the National Constitution. Inroads are daily making on the eternal rights of the people, through the instrumentality of a designing, corrupt, and mercenary priesthood. May the Lord in mercy either make the people wiser, or these spiritual usurpers, much better.

EXTRACT OF A LETTER TO THE EDITOR,

Dated, East Halley, (Up. Can.) Jan. 1825.

A sermon was delivered in this place on the 4th inst. by the Rev. Jonathan Woodman, from 2 Peter. ii. 9. "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust until the day of judgment to be punished."

The speaker, in the first place, undertook to show, how mankind became ungodly, which was by eating the forbidden fruit; and he observed that the threatening was to be death, in consequence of disobedience; which some were pleased to call *spiritual death*; and that all were willing to admit it was a "death in trespasses and sins."

In his second proposition, the preacher dwelt on the judgment and resurrection of the dead; remarking, very distinctly, that all men would be made alive in Christ, in the *same sense*, in which they died in Adam, which, he said, was *temporal death*; and, consequently, to be made alive in Christ, meant nothing more, than to be raised from the dead. And yet, said he, "it is becoming very popular in our day, for men to preach that all men will be saved. But I have no doubt there are hundreds that will sink to endless perdition, for preaching this lying doctrine. They are some of the unjust, who are reserved unto the day of judgment, to be punished."

Now it is not my intention to offer any argument in refutation of such confused preaching as the above; because to the understanding of candid, unprejudiced hearers, it carries its refutation on its very face. The preacher not only contradicted himself, by first admitting that the death spoken of was *spiritual*, and then saying it was merely *temporal*, but he subjected himself to severe criticism; because, if the death was *temporal*, and the being made alive was in the *same sense*, then it follows, that, the resurrection through Christ, will only make us such frail, mortal, living creatures as we now are. It will not render us immortal.

Not only so, but the Rev. gentleman has an account to settle with St. Paul; who not only preached that "God will have all men to be saved," but also, that "the living God is the Saviour of all men," and this, Mr. W. calls a "lying doctrine." We must admit, either that St. Paul was unjust in preaching that doctrine, or that Mr. Woodman is not justifiable in thus accusing him. And which does the common sense and reason of man, teach us, is most likely to be the case? Is it not *unjust* for a public teacher, to accuse St. Paul and all others who preach, that God is the Saviour of all men, of holding forth a lying doctrine? I am constrained to express my sincere rejoicing, that it is "becoming popular to preach this" old fashioned doctrine. Popularity is all which is wanting, to insure the co-operation of many who now oppose it. A. A.

To Correspondents.—"EPSILON" will appear in our next. "CHAUNCEY" likewise. "X" as soon as convenient. "SINCERITY" is received.

MARRIED,

In this town, Mr. Nathaniel Moody to Miss Caroline Woodman.—Mr. Arthur Davis to Miss Sophia Chase.

By Elder Samuel Rand, Mr. Charles Green to Miss Elizabeth Rand.

In New-Gloucester, Mr. Daniel K. Littlefield to Miss Dolly B. Sawyer.

DIED,

In this town, Mr. Josiah Wilson, aged 33.—Miss Prudence H. Varnum, daughter of Gen. P. Varnum, aged 16.—Widow Susan Hall, aged 47.—A son of Capt. Charles Alden, aged 2 years and 5 months.—A daughter of Mr. William Small, aged 10 months.—A child of Mr. Jabez Clapp, aged 2 years.

In Westbrook, of a pulmonary complaint, Mr. Samuel Cummeus, formerly of this town, aged 37. He has left a wife and three children to deplore his loss.

In Fairfield, Jan. 28th, Levi Barrett, jr. aged 10 years, the only son and youngest child of L. Barrett, Esq.

In Bath, on the 4th inst. Mr. Amos Lunt, formerly of this town, in the 27th year of his age. Mr. L. was a man of respectable talents and standing in society, and possessed of an affable and engaging disposition. His loss will not only be painfully realized by his widowed companion and children, by his aged mother who is bereft of her only son, and his affectionate sisters, but his loss will be deeply deplored by all who were acquainted with his moral excellence and worth.

In Livermore, on the 1st inst. Rev. Thomas Wyman, of a consumption. He was a preacher of the Baptist persuasion, but owing to a feeble state of health, he had been constrained mostly to relinquish his ministerial labors, for many years. His death will be duly realized by his family and friends;—but they can derive much consolation from the belief that he has exchanged worlds to his great and everlasting advantage.

In Union, on the 4th inst. John Morrell, a son of Col. John Bachelder, aged 4 years and 5 months. While playing on the ice with other small boys, this promising child was drowned.

It has become our painful duty to announce to our fellow-citizens, the decease of the Revolutionary Patriot, His Excellency WILLIAM EUSTIS, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. He departed this life at his winter residence in this city, on Sunday morning last, about 7 o'clock, in the 73d year of his age, after a short but severe illness of about a week's duration.—*Boston Patriot of Monday last.*

Sacred Lyre.



FROM THE UNIVERSALIST MAGAZINE.

INVOCATION TO WINTER.

From polar worlds, where endless frost
Has chain'd the ocean to the coast,
Parent of storms, chill Winter! rise,
And roll thy clouds o'er southern skies.
On GREENLAND'S hills, of cheerless white,
Descend, in mingled storm and night;
Burst her tall rocks, with frightful roar,
And show'r their fragments o'er the shore.
Thence rushing on the dark'ning waves,
Where HUDSON'S flood in fury raves,
Thine ice-fields call, o'er midnight seas,
To their tremendous revelries.
Sweep o'er the mountains, from the shore
Of bleak and barren LABRADOR;
And sailing down the frozen globe,
Spread out thy thick-wrought snowy robe
On CANADA'S extended scene,
And BRUNSWICK'S hills of evergreen;
Till, last, amid our southern skies,
Thy black'ning tempests frowning, rise.

Come, Winter, come! and bring again,
Health, vigor, pleasure, in thy train.
The town shall pour its joyous bands,
In flying cars, along the lands;
Who, as they glide o'er hill and dale,
Shall breathe the fresh vigor from thy gale.
Open Mirth and lively Glee,
Dance and Revel wait on thee;
Labor looks with cheerful smile,
And even Drudgery rests awhile.

But chief, O Winter, with thee bring
Thy long and hallowed evening.
Soon as the short-liv'd day is past,
We'll close the door and shutters fast;
The blazing fire shall light the room,
And books or friends the night consume;
While still, with ceaseless sigh, and slow,
Descends, without, the drifting snow.

Come, Winter, come! and with thee bring
Thy long and hallow'd evening. MARCUS.

FROM THE UNIVERSALIST MAGAZINE.

REV. MR. SABINE'S LECTURES.

Mr. SABINE finished his Lectures in reply to Mr. BALFOUR, on the evening of last Sabbath. After he had closed, our friend Dr. ABRAHAM R. THOMPSON, of Charlestown, delivered the following remarks in relation to the subject, which, at our request, he gave us for publication.—Eds.

My Friends—The Rev. Mr. SABINE having now closed his lectures, I request the privilege of making a few observations to you on the subject of his labors. The Rev. Gentleman, of his own free will, offered his services in the public papers, to examine and refute Mr. BALFOUR'S Book, provided he might be allowed the use of a pulpit. This religious Society, in the genuine spirit of free inquiry, unanimously offered him their pulpit, and you, my friends, have patiently and candidly attended the discussion. Some of you have read Mr. Balfour's book, but many have attended these lectures who have not read the book. Those of you who have read the book, will bear me witness, that those who have not, cannot possibly form a correct idea of it from Mr. Sabine's lectures. In justice therefore to the cause of truth, to the author of the book, and to those who have not read it, I feel constrained to state explicitly, but briefly, what the purpose and scope of this book are. The object of Mr. Balfour's book, then, from the beginning to the end, is TO SHOW THAT HELL WAS NOT A PLACE OF ENDLESS MISERY, AS HAS BEEN GENERALLY AND LONG BELIEVED. This the Author shows incontrovertibly, by a consideration of all the texts where the words rendered Hell in our common version occur. He also spent two sections of the book, in stating a number of facts, that the inspired writers did not consider Hell as a place of endless misery, nor of any misery in a future state, as has been supposed—that no prophet in the Old Testament, nor yet our Saviour, nor his Apostles, in the New, ever used the word Hell to

express a state of punishment in the future world. He also traced the doctrine of Hell, as a place of endless misery, to heathenism as its origin—and adduced some quotations from believers in the doctrine of hell torments to prove it. What then has Mr. Sabine done in refuting these things? Did he take up the texts, and show that the author of the book had wrested these texts? had perverted them? Has he taken up any of the facts, and shown them to be false?—Or has he even told his audience that He believes Hell to be a place of endless misery? His work was to answer a book, not to make it; but has he not in quoting it, altered it, and found constant fault with the author, because he did not write the book to suit him? He quoted but little of the book; (and two whole sections which contain the great body of material facts, he has not quoted at all, nor even alluded to) and when he made quotations, he never, in a single sentence, referred his hearers to the page, that they might read and judge for themselves.

As Mr. Sabine has not fulfilled his engagement to the public in refuting the book,—let us advert to what he has attempted to do in his discourses. The avowed object of Mr. S.'s discourses was to establish a future retribution—its endless duration he does not advocate, but stated that he would leave every man to form his own opinion as to its duration. His orthodox friends he found fault with, for preaching hell torments so much, and said it was only the weaker part of them that did so. Had the "Author of the Inquiry" only advocated a future retribution, all would have been well. This was not the object of the book, nor is any thing said in it, either affirming or denying it. In the Book, the Author repeatedly expresses his readiness to believe the doctrine of endless misery, if it can be established from Scripture; but shows that the texts which speak about Hell, have been perverted in support of it.—Supposing Mr. S. to have proved beyond all contradiction a future retribution, this is no answer to the book which he undertook to refute. But has he proved this? Let every one who has heard him, say, if he has proved either of the two following things, which require to be both proved, to establish the doctrine of a future retribution. 1st. Has he proved that the soul of man, at death, goes to Hades, Scheol, Tartarus, or Gehenna, as a place or state of punishment? 2d. Has he proved that such souls are actually in misery there? The most plausible proof he advanced was, the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. But seemingly at a loss in what sense to view it, he first considered it a parable, then renounced it, and called on the author of the book to prove it to be a parable. But the parable says not a word about the soul of the rich man in Hades or Hell. Unless Mr. S. believes that the soul has eyes, and ears, and a tongue, &c. in a separate state from the body, how can this prove his point? Truly, if we are to become believers in a state of torment in the new life of incorruption and immortality, which the glorious gospel of Jesus Christ brings to light, as "the free gift of God, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace before the foundation of the world;" our Rev. Friend Sabine must furnish some better ground for our faith, than the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. That Hades at least sometimes means the grave, is not denied by Mr. S.—and all said in the parable agrees to the body there, but does not accord with a spirit in a future state, separate from the body. But it may be said that Mr. S. has proved a future retribution from the passages which speak of a future judgment. Yes, he attempted to prove this; but did he show from any of those passages that this judgment was in a future state? which was the point to be proved, to be to his purpose. All the texts he advanced fell short of this; and we were rather surprised, that something more plausible was not advanced by him. In short, Mr. S. has not only forgotten to meet the facts and arguments of the book, proving that hell is not a place of endless misery, but he has failed much more than we expected to establish his doctrine of future retribution. He has neither refuted the book, nor established anything definite in opposition to it.

Having said thus much about Mr. Sabine's attempts against Mr. Balfour's book, we must, in justice to our own feelings, say something of his treatment of our friend the author. Those who have not read Mr. B.'s book, and have no personal knowledge of him, would certainly form a terrible idea of the man, from the portrait of him in Mr. S.'s lectures. Mr. B. is there charged with sophistry, insincerity and falsehood, with denying all penalty or punishment for sin, with abetting and upholding all infidelity and all immorality, with first perverting, then denying divine revelation,—with attempting to unhinge and throw down the whole moral system, thus to dethrone the moral Ruler of the universe. Mr. S. allows Mr. B. the best abilities, but then accuses him of the worst designs against the best interests both of God and man, and thus adroitly hangs him up between heaven and earth, as fit for neither. But my friends, remember, a good cause is never made better by personal abuse, and a bad one is always made worse. As the best possible refutation of every thing which can be said against Mr. B.'s book is to read it; so the best possible refutation of every thing that has been said against the man, is to know him as we do.

I would now give notice that Mr. Sabine's Lectures are to be printed, and will be reviewed by Mr. Balfour; and also that Mr. B. intends immediately to publish a second edition of his book, in a cheaper form. Thus both those books will be before the public, within the reach of every man who feels

disposed to read and examine for himself. And you will allow me to say, that this subject is one of those things which belong to our everlasting peace. What the Rev. Mr. S. or the Rev. Mr. B. may say, or what any other man, reverend or irreverend, may say, on this solemn subject, is of little consequence either to you or me, who are travelling together to another world. But what God, our Father in heaven, has said in his word, on this subject, is of infinite importance for all to know. Give me leave, then, to recommend a course to you, which will be equally just to the cause of truth, to your own minds, and to the Rev. Gentlemen who appear before you as parties in this question. First take Mr. Balfour's book in one hand and the Bible in the other, and read seriously what Mr. B. has written, and compare it critically with the divine testimony. Having done this faithfully, then take Mr. Sabine's book, and read and compare it in the same manner,—then judge for yourselves. I ask no more.

MODERN MISSIONARIES.

The "Wesleyan Arminian and Christian Instructor," is remarking on the proposition in the London Literary Gazette, of a capital of 20,000,000 pounds for converting the Jews, ob-

serves: "From all the attention we have been able to give the subject, we deem this piece of satire to be nearly as just as it is severe; but it would give us great satisfaction to learn to the contrary. This monied machine for converting sinners from the error of their ways, was unknown to St. Paul. He gloried in that he had not been chargeable to any, and that he had preached the gospel of Christ freely; his own hands ministering to his necessities while he taught publicly and from house to house, with labor and travail, night and day, warning every man and teaching every man, with tears, to turn from idolatry and wickedness, to the worship and service of the one living and true God. To promote the glory of God and the salvation of men was the great business of his life; and the success of his labors correspond with the purity of his motives and the uprightness of his conduct. Marching forth thus in the plenitude of his great Maker's strength, darkness fled before him;—idolatry trembled and fell at his approach; and thousands were by his ministry brought from darkness unto light, and from the power of Satan to God.

"Such missionaries, and such alone, can succeed in evangelizing the heathen world. But we have reason to fear, from the little success of many of our modern missionaries, that they have gone forth without these qualifications, and of course without the sanction of the Great Head of the Church; for those whom he calls to this work, he qualifies for it, and their labor shall not be in vain in the Lord. The desire of their heart shall be granted them, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in their hands."

"In what light must we then view many of our modern missionaries in the east, when we consider the following statements made by themselves? The Rev. Mr. Adams of Calcutta, gives it as his opinion, that there are not more than 300 converts in all the missionary stations in India. The Baptist missionaries of Calcutta, made but four converts in 6 years labor; and the Independent missionaries, whose resources were much greater, laboured 7 years and gained but one convert. And it is supposed, perhaps not without justice, that some if not many of these embraced christianity from a love of novelty and motives of interest, rather than from the power of renovating faith.

"These are certainly alarming facts to the friends of missions; and it is to be feared that many of those gentlemen visit the east rather for the purpose of gaining knowledge than that of saving souls; and the effect is worthy of its cause—they reap according to what they sow. But the supporters of those missionaries would do well to consider these things; and whether it be their duty to support so many travellers in the east without some better evidences of their usefulness to the cause of christianity.

"The faith and spirit possessed by Paul, by Luther, or by Wesley, though entirely destitute of money or friends, would not have labored seven years in making one convert. No—hundreds, if not thousands, would in that time have been brought to bow to the sceptre of redeeming grace. All the gold of Ophir and the wealth of America, cannot succeed in converting the heathen. If our missionaries would succeed in this great work, they must carry with them the spirit and power of Christ; they must affect less of the gentleman traveller, and more of the humble servants of all men for Christ's sake.

"But money, money, is the cry. Give us money and we will convert the heathen. Fatal delusion! The salvation of souls cannot be purchased with money. If half the time that is spent in begging money for missionary and charitable institutions, was spent in fervent prayer to God for the power of the Holy Spirit to attend our missionary efforts, there would be perhaps ten, if not a hundred souls converted to God, where there is one now."

THE CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER,

IS PUBLISHED EVERY OTHER SATURDAY MORNING,

AT THE ARGUS OFFICE,

BY RUSSELL STREETER, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

TODD & SMITH.....PRINTERS.